UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

DEMOCRACY

Joseph Ernest McAfee

Kirtley F. Mather

Harry Taylor

Frank E. Baker

Dorothy Thompson

Victor S. Yarros

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 9

Chicago, July 4, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 131

ARTICLES—
What Does Democracy Mean?—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 134
A New Dynamic for Democracy—KIRTLEY F. MATHER 135
The American Way—HARRY TAYLOR 136
Democracy—A Form of Social Control—FRANK E. BAKER 139
Welcome to Thomas Mann—DOROTHY THOMPSON 140
The "Revolution"—What Is To Be Done?—VICTOR S. YARROS 141

POETRY—
Boa Constrictor—LOUIS GINSBERG 133

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Inwardness of Democracy—JAMES M. YARD 143

CORRESPONDENCE—
An Appeal to Save the World—UPTON SINCLAIR 144
Coöperative Managers—ROBERT L. SMITH, *Assistant Secretary, Eastern Coöperative League* 144

THE FIELD—
Salute to the President—*The Churchman* 130
Counsel to Churches and Synagogues 130

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Salute to the President

Bill Spofford, rector of Christ Church, Middletown, New Jersey, and executive secretary of the Church League for Industrial Democracy, spoke some forthright words at Temple Emmanuel, Jewish synagogue in Jersey City, on June 3. He declared that the President of the United States would "be beaten up by Mayor Hague's plug-uglies if he attempted to say in Journal Square what he said to the convention of B'nai B'rith" two weeks earlier. He continued:

> Two days after a Hague lynching party gathered in Journal Square to prevent two Congressmen from speaking for civil liberties, President Roosevelt said to this fraternal order, "Our conception of freedom embraces complete liberty of conscience and of thought, freedom of education, freedom of the press, the right of free speech and assembly. On that conception of liberty all of our happiness as a nation has been built."

Those are noble words which our President might well deliver in Jersey City. He has said repeatedly that he cannot let the people down. Well, there is nothing more important than the people's freedom—all the relief programs in the world are of no use if the people are to be slaves. They want to know whether the President means what he says. Mayor Hague is the vice-chairman of the National Democratic Committee. He has delivered the state of New Jersey to Roosevelt in the last two presidential elections. Which is the more important, those votes or "this conception of liberty upon which our happiness as a nation is built"? President Roosevelt must choose and he cannot duck it by declaring that the denial of the Bill of Rights in Jersey City is a local issue.

The Churchman.

Counsel to Churches and Synagogues

Everett R. Clinchy, Executive Director of the National Conference of Jews and Christians, has recently returned from a two-months visit to Germany, Austria, and other European countries. On the basis of his observations, he offers the following articles of counsel to American churches and synagogues as reported in the *Christian Century* (June 15th):

1. Steadfastly maintain the American separation of church and state. While individual church and synagogue members should be politically active and responsible citizens, as a matter of course, the religious societies must be nonpolitical. Without doubt, a degree of dependence upon subventions of the states has created difficulties for the churches in some other lands.

2. Intransigently maintain the fact of the sovereignty of God above the State, and the supreme worth of the human personality.

(*Continued on page* 144)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXI MONDAY, JULY 4, 1938 No. 9

FREEDOM OF OPINION

Freedom of opinion, of speech, and of the press is our most valuable privilege, the very soul of republican institutions, the safeguard of all other rights.

We may learn its value if we reflect that there is nothing which tyrants so much dread. They anxiously fetter the press; they scatter spies through society, that the murmurs, anguish, and indignation of their oppressed subjects may be smothered in their own breasts; that no generous sentiment may be nourished by sympathy and mutual confidence. Nothing awakes and improves men so much as free communication of thoughts and feelings. Nothing can give to public sentiment that correctness which is essential to the prosperity of a commonwealth but the free circulation of truth from the lips and pens of the wise and good.

If such men abandon the right of free discussion; if awed by threats, they suppress their convictions; if rulers succeed in silencing every voice but that which approves them; if nothing reaches the people but what would lend support to men in power—farewell to liberty. The form of a free government may remain; but the life, the soul, the substance is fled.

—William Ellery Channing.

THE NATIONAL HOLIDAY

We have recently, and belatedly, been reading the novels of Kenneth Roberts, probably the most distinguished historical novelist of our time, another and greater James Fenimore Cooper. In these books, particularly in *Arundel* and *Rabble in Arms,* Mr. Roberts deals with the Revolutionary War—Arnold's march upon Quebec, Burgoyne's invasion of the colonies, and so on. His material includes not merely scenes of fighting and adventure, but the life of the people in the villages and on the farms, and always the political and social background of the whole American world. Most of us are familiar only with the more sentimental and romantic depiction of the Revolution—heroism in every household, sacrifice in every heart!—and therefore are quite unprepared for the stern and disillusioning realism with which Mr. Roberts presents the War for Independence. The dirt, sordidness, and sheer cowardice of much of it are shocking beyond description. The reluctance of the people to fight, their enlistment only on strict terms of money and favor, their shameless profiteering at the expense of the army, the jealousy and ill-will between the several colonies, the bickering, backbiting, and betrayal among the leaders, the corruption of the politicians and many of the soldiery, the drinking, the irresponsibility, the incompetence, the shame—it is all pretty dreadful. But through it all, and in the end predominating, runs the strain of sublime courage and utter consecration, beginning with Washington and going down through many a humble man and woman, which won the war. And it is this pure gold, thank God, and not the mass of dross, which we remember, and rightly remember, because it is this gold which is precious since it made America free. The same is true today! There are meanness, selfishness, sordidness, sheer corruption in this country—so much of it that it appalls us. There are also cruelty and prejudice and hate, and violence and lawlessness rampant among us. He who would despair may find reason for doing so. But here in America today, as well, there are integrity and honor, the progressive spirit and the humane ideal, private virtue and public devotion, the love of liberty and the passion for brotherhood—and for all our ill, these qualities predominate among us. So are we still free, and so shall we remain free!

A NEUTRALITY PACT

At a time when our newspapers were filling columns of first-page space with sensational stories about the Cash kidnapping case in Florida, the John Roosevelt wedding in Massachusetts, the Indianapolis automobile race, and other sports events, the Congressional primaries here, there, and yon, interspersed with the continuing horror tales from Spain and China, a news-despatch of momentous historic importance was all but buried and thus lost. We refer to the announcement carried by our greatest newspapers inconspicuously in inside pages, and by most of our newspapers not at all, that Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, and Finland had signed and sealed a solemn pact pledging themselves to a common neutrality policy in the event of war between other states in Europe. This Scandinavian Neutrality Pact, as it has come to be called, may well prove to be the greatest event of this current year—infinitely more important than all the wars and rumors of wars now vexing the world, especially as giving hope for the future of democracy on this whirling sphere! These five nations may be supposed to know something about democracy—they have the best brand of it in the world today! They may be presumed also to know something about war—they lived with it for four years in 1914-18! They surely know something as well about

Naziism and its menace for the future—they have it right next door! And lo, they solemnly resolve that the best service they can render their own national interests, and the cause of democracy, and the general welfare of mankind, in this dreadful crisis, is to *remain rigorously neutral in the event of another war.* If such policy is good for these countries, why not for our own as well? Tell us, please, wherein there is any difference between America and the Scandinavian countries which warrants the former following a different policy from the latter. We are farther away from the danger-zone—which means only that we have far less reason to be concerned with what goes on in Europe! We are bigger in territory, population, and wealth—but sheer material power justifies no suspension of wise judgment and moral principle, unless we deliberately choose to play the brute in our own interest! It is this latter motive—selfish imperialistic interest, masquerading under the guise of democratic idealism—which is the real driving-power behind the hypocritical issue of "collective security." The Scandinavian countries have shown us the truth, and are pointing us the way.

WAGES AND HOURS

The Wages and Hours Bill, as at last enacted by compromise agreement between House and Senate, is probably satisfactory to nobody. We doubt if many who voted for it understood what it is all about, or could guess how it will actually work out in practice. As for the citizens, how many readers of this paper (including the editors) could pass an examination as to its provisions? Nevertheless, we are glad the bill was passed, and rejoice therefore that the administration refused to take defeat for an answer, and insisted upon the measure in some form being enacted. For what we have here, as in the case of the sadly defective Social Security Act, is the establishment in law of a great principle—that wages and conditions of labor are a matter of public concern, and that the power of government may be rightly used to establish standards. Too long, under our existing industrial system, have the workers been left to get what they could in exchange for their labor. In prosperous times, the workers enjoyed a little improvement in wages and hours; in bad or moderate times, they were the first to suffer under the attack of the profit-makers. Wage-slavery was something more than a picturesque phrase of rhetoric! The first step out of this condition of barbarism was trade union organization to the end of collective bargaining as between capital and labor. This process is not yet completed, but is advancing rapidly and will soon be everywhere established in great industries. The second step was the passage of the minimum wage laws in the several states, and the setting up of minimum wage boards to hear complaints and regulate standards. This was a tremendous gain, especially for the unorganized workers in small shops and factories. Now comes the federal government, with its Wages and Hours Bill for interstate business—a third step of vast importance! The day of starvation wages and killing hours is gone. To safeguard the workers is now everywhere recognized as a part of the social welfare concern of government.

RAILROADS

It's amazing to read about the railroads these days. On one side of the page we read of these two miracle trains which have just been put in service between New York and Chicago by the Pennsylvania and the New York Central Railroads. These trains are evidently the last word for speed, comfort, and beauty. They cut down the running time between the two largest cities of the country to sixteen hours; they banish the traditional Pullman sleeping berths, and substitute separate drawing and sleeping rooms as in a hotel; they flash and gleam in stream-lined grace, as though a meteor were captured and harnessed to man's service. But on another side of the newspaper page, we read another story! It is that of the progressive sickness, even unto collapse, of American railroad systems. Approximately one hundred roads are in the courts. Jesse Jones, chairman of the R.F.C., estimates that not more than eight railroads will be able to cover their fixed charges this year. In 1932, at the bottom of the depression, the net operating income of the nation's railroads was $326,000,000; for the first four months of this year, the net is less than $90,000,000. In 1932, the average number of employes on the railroads was 1,031,703; in March, 1938, the figure was 927,746. The railroads have announced a reduction in wages on July 1, and the workers have announced a strike. The difference between the two pictures of the kings in *Hamlet* was no greater than this difference between the two sides of American railroading at this hour. "If the railroads are really doomed," says the New York *Times,* "they seem to be resolved to go down with colors flying"—"broke, but splendid," to quote another phrase! But *are* they doomed? Have automobiles and airplanes combined to make them as out-of-date as the electric trolleys? We cannot believe so! Railroads in stricken Europe are still a source of income. Why not here? There may be many answers, but they all center, we believe, about the old question of private *vs.* public ownership. To think of abandoning railroads seems to us as ridiculous as to think of abandoning highways. But there came a time in the history of highways when private (toll) roads had to go. Why not the same with railroads?

ROMAIN ROLLAND ENDS HIS LONG EXILE

It was a dramatic, indeed a historic moment when Romain Rolland returned last month to France, to end an exile in Switzerland that had endured for twenty-four years. The great French novelist was at the height of his world fame when the Great War broke out in 1914. Only a few years before he had completed his immortal masterpiece, *Jean Christophe,* which won for

him and for his native country the glory of the Nobel Prize for Literature. To have been swept into the tidal flow of French patriotism which was released when the German troops crossed the border, to have joined his voice to the shrill cry of barbarism which leaped from the lips of his compatriots everywhere, the intellectuals as well as the great masses of the people, would have been easy. But Romain Rolland was artistically an internationalist and spiritually an idealist, and he would not sell his soul to the horrid business of war. All he could see in 1914 was a world of culture, enlightenment, and beauty, the single civilization of Europe, rent even unto death by fratricidal strife, and on behalf of humanity he lifted his heroic voice in protest and dismay. To be a pacifist in France in 1914 was a supreme instance of moral courage. Who can forget, when will mankind ever forget, those scathing denunciations of militarism and appeals for peace which came from Rolland's pen in the early months of the war, later gathered into the volume entitled *Above the Battle?* Furious was the wrath turned upon this man for his unswerving fidelity to the highest ideals of the soul. Premier Clemenceau vowed to high heaven he would try and execute him for treason. Exile was inevitable. Yet Rolland never faltered—witness his *Clerambault!* But now the years have passed, feelings have softened as ideas have changed, and Rolland returns to the home of his ancestors in the village of Clamecy, in Burgundy, to live and in the end to die among his people. What this countryside means to him is shown in his *Colas Breugnon Burgundian,* one of Rolland's most delightful books, full of humor, pathos, and infinite charm. We love to think of the peace which will now drop down upon Rolland's soul after this quarter-century of loneliness and storm. We salute the most heroic European of our time as he sits by the hearthstone of his fathers.

HAGUE AND JERSEY CITY

Mayor Hague is the man who has taken upon himself all the odium attaching to the suppression of civil liberties in his notorious bailiwick of Jersey City. But we see no reason why this "last of the bosses" should walk off with all the dishonor. Why should he not share it with those who are sustaining him in the most egregious betrayal of liberty known to the history of the nation? Some weeks ago, as a matter of fact, Mayor Hague made display of his support in a public parade and celebration, and it certainly was some display. As a study of the American mind today in the face of a wanton denial by force and violence of every freedom belonging to citizenship in this republic, we submit the following list of organizations represented by huge delegations of marchers in Hague's parade:

American Legion
Hudson County Building Trades, Teamsters Union, and other American Federation of Labor groups
Hudson County Bar Association
Masons
Odd Fellows
Elks
Loyal Order of Moose
Knights of Columbus
Knights of Pythias
Ancient Order of Hibernians
Lions
Kiwanis
Rotary
Eagles
Junior Order of American Mechanics
Civic Organizations of the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 10th Wards
Independent Jewish Organizations
Chamber of Commerce
National Grocery Company
National Products Refining Company
National Bag Corporation
Cudahy Packing Company
Seabord Terminal and Refrigerator Company and the
W.P.A.

This is a partial list as published in the New York *Times.* Mayor Hague boasts that Jersey City is with him in his denial of public liberties through deliberate suppression of constitutional rights. Mayor Hague is right. Jersey City is a whole community suddenly gone Fascist.

Boa Constrictor

Boa constrictor, boa constrictor!—
  Watch it creeping there.
Stealthy it crawls with scales of hatred.
  World, beware! beware!

This terror that dons the serpent's form
  Its coils on culture clamps.
Then baleful this python basks and nests
  In concentration camps.

This boa constrictor slithers and strikes!—
  Its tracks are thousands slain:
It twines on helpless Austria;
  It tightens on gasping Spain.

It coils in each land, this serpent of brown,
  This python with poisonous breath.
Its name is Fear. Its name is Torture.
  Another name is Death.

See how it writhes in madness for prey.
  Watch it coiling there.
Boa constrictor, boa constrictor!
  World, beware! beware!

LOUIS GINSBERG.

What Does Democracy Mean?

JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

Democracy is a way of life, an order of society. In so far as lexicographers are content with definitions which direct attention solely to political government, they are wrong. They are proved wrong by current discussion throughout the western world, and by much historical usage.

Democracy is that order of society in which all the citizens may take part in determining the policies of the community and all may share equitably in the rewards of common labors.

The American fathers gave particular concern to the shaping of means by which democracy might function in the field of politics, and succeeding generations have done much to perfect that machinery. This particular mechanism is still, however, far from complete and efficient.

The fathers promptly perceived that free political institutions can be secure only as the general culture of the people has been democratized. Hence their zeal in organizing our system of publication. Much experience has demonstrated that this system can best fulfill its mission only as it employs a social mechanism of its own, not directly dependent upon the machinery of politics. For generations, enlightened effort has been put forth to divorce the schools from political control. This system is also incomplete, requiring more efficient methods among the young and extension into the field of adult life.

The foremost social issues of today point to the democratizing of the community's economic order. The let-alone policy by which the fathers sought to insure freedom and opportunity for all has, under the changed conditions of today, become a denial of this freedom. New social policies are required for the preservation of economic democracy. Most Americans believe that these policies should be applied through a mechanism directly adapted to the particular purpose, and not by imposing upon the political machinery functions which it is manifestly not able efficiently to discharge. Search is therefore being made for means of achieving the desired end with a minimum of interference by the standard political mechanism.

The issues of tomorrow, perhaps an early tomorrow, will turn upon the democratizing of the community's religious life. The device of the fathers by which they sought to insure religious freedom for all through "a free church in a free state," has actually resulted in the committing of the organized religious life of the community to the control of socially irresponsible sectarian hierarchies. Under this system the community is unable effectively to employ the religious impulses and energies of the citizens for the ends of the democratic order.

The assertion that the majority rules in a democracy is misleading; the concept is largely a holdover from and refinement of government under despotic auspices. In that old sense of the term, nobody rules in a well-ordered democracy. When the common good demands definitive social action in a particular time and place, the majority's superior authority is properly employed. But arbitrary employment of the majority's power to control the common thinking, or speech, or educational processes, is as reprehensible as is attempted control by a minority.

That society is most truly democratic in which decisions are reached through common consent, and in which minority resistance to established policies is practically negligible. The embittered rivalry of mutually antagonistic parties, each bent upon seizure of place and power for itself, is inimical to the best interests of a democratic community. Only as free discussion and intelligent concerted action by the whole community are achieved, are democratic institutions secure. Partisanship is the bane of democracy.

The individual is not a social end; the community is the end. The freedom of the individual in a democratic society does not inhere in assumed "natural rights"; it can claim a nobler birthright. It is the democratic community's means of insuring its own perpetuity and prosperity.

Only as the community can avail itself of the initiative, resourcefulness, creative energy and intelligent loyalty of the citizenry, are its institutions secure. Democracy guarantees the freedom of the individual, therefore, so as to safeguard the existence and security of society.

An individual who conceives of himself as an end, and acts on that assumption, becomes an enemy of the social order. He preys upon the community, subordinating its interests to his own selfish ends. He violates his proper function, and, within the limits of his power, becomes guilty of frustrating the ends of democracy, and of destroying democratic society.

Democracy differs from all despotic and anarchistic systems of society in making the common will and well-being the supreme arbiter of differences, the ultimate standard of values, the end of individual and social life.

Democracy finds in ordered society the fulfillment of its aims, and insures freedom to each individual and social group as the prime requisite of the community's existence and healthy development. Democracy's aim is the ever more abounding life in the good society.

Contributors

FRANK E. BAKER: President of State Teachers College, Milwaukee.

LOUIS GINSBERG: Poet.

KIRTLEY F. MATHER: Professor of Geology, Harvard University.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE: Director of Community Service, Community Church, New York City.

UPTON SINCLAIR: Author.

ROBERT L. SMITH: Assistant Secretary of Eastern Coöperative League, New York City.

HARRY TAYLOR: Pastor of Congregational Church, Pittsfield, N. H.

DOROTHY THOMPSON: Journalist and lecturer.

JAMES M. YARD: Director of the Chicago Round Table of the National Conference of Jews and Christians.

VICTOR S. YARROS: Attorney and journalist.

A New Dynamic for Democracy

KIRTLEY F. MATHER

It is not at all surprising that many thoughtful people occasionally become discouraged concerning the future of democracy as a way of organizing human beings for the difficult task of living in an age like ours. The democratic ideal is fine; but to put that ideal into practical operation may be beyond our ability. Certainly any fair appraisal of the contemporary situation would lead to the conclusion that something must be done to renew the vitality of our zeal for the democratic way of life. Can the great mass of citizens acquire the ability to govern themselves wisely before civilization comes crashing down upon our heads in an avalanche of devastation? If we can answer that question in the affirmative, and demonstrate the correctness of our answer, we will go a long way toward turning the tide which is even now threatening to submerge the democratic nations of the earth.

This is of course the golden opportunity for adult education. In educational meetings the emphasis is being repeatedly placed upon the fact that the fundamental objective of adult education is the free functioning of the critical faculties properly balanced by the training of people for coöperation with others. Adults must develop the faculty of thinking for themselves rather than continue in the habit of depending upon someone else to tell them what to think. Or, as it more frequently transpires, they must acquire the ability to choose wisely from among the many conflicting suggestions and recommendations which are broadcast to the multitude by the few who assume the role of guide and prophet. Furthermore, they must develop those emotional attitudes and intellectual capacities which are necessary for harmonious living in the midst of the modern community. Only when there is intelligent consideration for others, self-restraint, and self-discipline, as well as a willingness to share even with those less efficient than oneself, can there be any hope of resolving the paradox of the individual in society.

These objectives of education are obviously the prerequisites for citizenship in a democracy. Their recognition goes far toward explaining the remarkable vitality of the movement for adult education in America at the present time. They also constitute a very real challenge to those who are responsible for providing ways and means whereby adults may be satisfactorily equipped for life in the dynamic and confusing world of the twentieth century. The demand is insistent that we try intelligence rather than passion as our guide through the jungle of class conflict, international jealousy, industrial competition, squandering of natural resources, and social delinquency. But how shall we go about it to capitalize intelligence?

To develop the critical faculties and to fit people for coöperation in a free spirit require a technique which is by no means fully known, but with which adult educators are experimenting at the present time in many very significant projects. Despite the value of lectures by silver-tongued experts, even with the appendix of a "forum period," and the unquestioned worth of "directed reading," there is no escape from the conclusion that such time-tried methods of adult education accomplish little in this particular direction. Granted that knowledge may be effectively dispensed in these ways, and that without knowledge there can be no thinking which possesses any real value, it is nevertheless true that listening and reading do not necessarily promote critical thought, and frequently fail to inculcate scientific habits of mind.

It is not surprising, therefore, that so much attention is now being paid in adult education circles to the "discussion method." Apparently the most favorable environment for the development of the critical faculties and the inculcation of habits of coöperation is presented by a group of ten or twenty adults from quite various scholastic backgrounds and diverse occupations, associated with an experienced, resourceful, and considerate leader in an informal setting. Such an organization for adult education means a complete departure from academic procedures with their customary formalities and rigid regimentation. Each individual is a person, to be respected by all his associates, including the leader. Each is free to display his own personality and to discover for himself the boundaries between his individual freedom and the rights of the group as a social unit.

In the interplay of active minds in such a diversified group, the gaps in intellectual equipment are often filled by mutual exchange. The prejudices which have arisen in the conditioning experiences of each member of the group are likely to be offset by those of others. "The dust of controversy! What is it, but the falsehood flying off?" Here, if anywhere, the adult may learn, by observation if not by his own experience, something about the "give and take" which characterizes coöoperation among men of good will. In such discussion groups there is both an environment in which critical faculties may be developed and an opportunity for practical experience in the fine art of coöperating with others in the all-important area of intellectual activity.

Mere discussion is, of course, no guaranty that beneficial results will follow. The response to the invitation "to talk it over" may only release a flood of misinformation and strengthen the irrational prejudices of the members of the group, especially if they all come from a similar background of schooling and occupation. Pooling the combined ignorance and passion of a score of individuals is not a contribution to adult education. Group discussion as a phase of education involves skills and attitudes which may be acquired only by training under wise leadership and through practice under expert guidance. Hence the necessity for organizations, plans, programs, and leaders.

Hence, also, the need for adequate financial support of adult education, both from governmental sources and from private funds. Small discussion groups are the most expensive of all the projects which come within our broad programs. Lectures, concerts and recitals may be largely or wholly financed from the fees paid by the members of the large audiences which they may attract, but small groups cannot be expected to produce the necessary funds by the payment of fees. Expert leadership, adequate quarters, small groups, low fees: these make a mutually conflicting assemblage. Nevertheless, some way must be found to solve that particular dilemma. The values we seek in this way are fully worth the investment which is demanded. The confer-

ence method and the group discussion have repeatedly proved their effectiveness in stimulating growth toward intellectual and emotional maturity.

Of prime importance in such group discussions is the attitude of the leader toward those associated with him. His aim must be to help the members of his group learn how to think for themselves rather than to tell them what to think. This is of course fundamental in the process of strengthening and utilizing the intellectual resources of the community. If society is to be successfully organized on a democratic basis, if we are actually to have efficient and wise government by the people, the citizens upon whom rests the responsibility of determining the course of collective action must be able to think for themselves. If they constantly depend upon somebody else to tell them what to think, they are not truly determining their own destiny; they are not governing themselves in democratic fashion, but are being governed autocratically by dictators. Especially when the group is dealing with a topic concerning which there are differences of opinion among experts who have given much studious thought to it, the leader must avoid giving the impression that he has found the final answer. Instead, he must constantly impose upon each member of the group the responsibility of seeking the answer, each for himself.

It is, however, obvious that "how to think" cannot be completely dissociated from "what to think." As Dr. Max Otto said, during one of the "public conversations" held at the Harvard Summer School in 1937: "Ideas come out of what we know. If thinking is anything, it is a certain way of handling knowledge. If you don't know anything, you have nothing to handle. You can't separate knowing things from thinking." Knowledge of the facts is prerequisite to the drawing of sound conclusions. Indeed, one of the most serious handicaps under which the citizens of America are attempting to meet the problems of contemporary life is the easy glibness with which they say "I think thus and so" concerning matters about which they really know little or nothing. Was it not Confucius who announced long ago, "Study without thought is vain; thought without study is dangerous"?

Often, the primary function of the group leader is to restrain his associates from jumping to conclusions before sufficient facts are in hand to warrant any generalization or to serve as a guide to action. In all probability, most adults do considerable thinking, and good thinking, too, concerning their own personal affairs and in the areas of thought and action which for one reason or another have become their own special province. Here, whether it be the garage mechanic searching for the cause of motor-stalling, the insurance salesman longing for the signature of an unusually resistant prospect, or the housewife concocting a new dessert, they have learned how to get and use the essential facts. Despite many evidences to the contrary, scientific habits of mind are far more prevalent today than they were a generation or so ago. The difficulty is that the rigorous discipline of accurate thinking is too infrequently carried over from the area of personal affairs and immediate financial interest to the broad fields of social problems, community relationships, and national and international affairs. The group leader, then, is not suggesting that his associates try something foreign to their nature as he attempts to help them learn how to think; he is merely urging them to use more extensively those procedures which they are already accustomed to use in a limited way. It is a process of growth, not of manufacture or creation.

In our social thinking, involving politics, economics, and community relationships, we are very apt to conceal our lack of knowledge by our excess of emotion. The concealment is from and for ourselves, and frequently is quite unconscious. But the results are just as dangerous as though it were deliberate. We think dogmatically, we feel strongly, we act blindly. The remedy is group discussion. Due process of policy making must be enshrined beside due process of law in our intellectual hall of fame. The essence of that process is discussion. It is around the conference table that differences of opinion can best be aired and at least some small measure of agreement discovered.

Perhaps the most important contribution to human welfare which may result from the current emphasis upon adult education will be the increase in willingness to "talk it over" and "think it through" before committing oneself to action. This would go far toward the utilization of the distinctively human resources which are available in the modern world. It implies a considerable degree of confidence in human nature, but that is basic in any program of real education. Indeed, it is implicit in the idea that intelligence may be capitalized in a democratic way.

The American Way

HARRY TAYLOR

"Fourscore and seven years ago," began Abraham Lincoln upon a historic occasion, "our forefathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

It almost seems that the mind of Lincoln instinctively went back to the Declaration of Independence when considering the essential genius of the American people. He might very easily have spoken of the Constitution, that historic document brought to the light of day after so many painful birth pangs. Being a lawyer himself, he might have elaborated the principles of the Constitution, its delicate adjustment of checks and balances, and its firm insistence on the separation of legislative, administrative, and judicial functions. But instead, Lincoln's mind settled on the principles of liberty and equality as basically American.

Perhaps if we follow Lincoln's example and for the moment forget the Constitution and all that the thought of it brings to our mind these days, we shall more easily get a glimpse into the American way. There will be more or less shrugging of the shoulders as the words liberty and equality are dragged from the background, but let that be as it may. It seems to me, as it evidently seemed to Abraham Lincoln, that here we have the clue to our American slant on life, to our essentially different way of living.

"Brought forth on this continent a new nation!" Let us get hold of that idea to begin with. Here, on this side of the water, the founders of our republic be-

gan an entirely new venture in human living, in an entirely original setting. They had heard the cry of liberty, equality, and fraternity many times in their lives, for these men were students of human institutions from earliest times. They knew that one might very easily get one's fingers burnt badly by toying with these ideas so full of spiritual dynamite. And yet they were unafraid in their bold declaration that these must be the foundation of the new order of society in the Americas. Over in Europe groups of men had fought hard for the establishment of these mighty principles but the conditions of life into which they had been born on the other side were too much for them. To an extent they might succeed but never in such proportions as to establish their right to claim for their new systems all that they had hoped. Over there, their efforts had for the most part been brought to naught by the ancient framework of kings and aristocrats, caste and custom, in which they had to build.

But in this country they had a virgin field for these principles of liberty and equality. The wilderness was a great leveler; what a man was mattered, not how he was born. In building a home for himself in the wilderness, Jack was as good or better than his master. When the trappings of feudalism were removed it was discovered that men were just men over here.

So, from the beginning, the words liberty and equality were the watchwords of the American people. It was not long before the United States of America was known across the water as "the land of the free." In thousands of hearts in every country in Europe the very thought of these United States set nerves atingling and hearts afire with desire to get here. For literally it meant for them release from servitude and the opportunity for a new and happy life under challenging and wonderful conditions.

In this new land of America any man born here could become President. He need not be of any special class nor need he possess a certain specific training. It was his manhood that mattered.

In a very real sense, this was a new nation, conceived in liberty. And this liberty was in no sense license. Those who accepted the boon of liberty, with few exceptions, knew that it meant for them self-denial, poverty, and the endurance of hardship. They had to exhibit unusual qualities of patience and fortitude to make good. Freedom in itself was for them just the removal of handicaps so that they might begin to do things; in itself it was a bane and not a blessing if not taken advantage of. That is to say: they had to *rise* to the challenge of liberty. It challenged them to be bigger and better men than they had ever had the chance of becoming before. Under that liberty, physically, mentally, and spiritually, they grew in stature. Law rode hand in hand with that freedom and guarded it when it encroached upon the liberty of others.

It was this desire for freedom and equality that led to the adoption of the ten amendments to the Constitution within a very short time after that instrument was ratified.

"Dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." When Lincoln spoke these words, of course, he had in mind the Negro and his claim to human equality. He saw the Negro as a human being, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. He saw that the differences of color, race, and class fell away and amounted to nothing before the fact that all men are men and have a right to be treated as men, free and equal.

It seems a far cry today to that tall, angular orator on the platform at Gettysburg. His problems and ours are so different—different, yet in essence they are the same. History always repeats itself. Its guise, its trappings may be different but the human problem underneath is the same.

In this year of grace 1938 the challenge of liberty and equality is different but it is the same old challenge to our American spirit. Liberty and equality are being virtually done to death in many lands, and we must look to ourselves lest the same things happen over here. Vast numbers of civilized people have allowed themselves to become vassals under the dominance of some dictator or other. They have thrown away their rights and privileges as free, self-determining human beings and allowed themselves to go around in fear and trembling lest some overlord discern that they have allowed treason to enter their soul. The idea of the superman is abroad in the world and if it comes over here it will destroy the last citadel of human freedom.

Let us disabuse our minds of any thought that there are "superior persons" in the world. The superior person is a sham and a bluff, and the more he claims superiority for himself the smaller a man he becomes. This is the ironical paradox of the dictator and the super-superior person! The higher he scrambles over the shoulders of his fellows, and the more powerful he becomes, the less of a person he really is. The dictator must say to himself all the time "I am the Man! None other is made in my mould!" His closest friends become his potential enemies. Mussolini takes away the second chair in his palace-office so that everyone who comes in to see him, be he the closest friend, must stand in the presence of almightiness. How pitiable, how contemptible are all the doings of these anti-humans who call themselves dictators! They must dwell alone in solitary grandeur, full of jealousy and malice towards even their nearest and dearest, lest in any way the limelight may be falling on others. Poor, miserable, pitiable specimen of humanity is the dictator or superman once he is enthroned. From that moment his humanity and his essential manhood dwindle and shrink.

The truly great personage hides his greatness if he happens to know of it. "Not unto us; not unto us!" is invariably the cry. Any high quality that is ours is just some divine power expressing itself through us. "Not unto us be the praise." One of the greatest psychologists of the human heart said: "He that would be greatest among you let him be your servant." This is in a very real sense the mellow wisdom of the ages. He who sins against this by exalting himself ruins both himself and all who are unfortunate enough to come under his power.

"Dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." The resources of our modern machine age are tremendous, tremendous for making supermen of all sorts and conditions of people. They can be heard over the air; they can have their names plastered in great letters over the front pages of our newspapers from coast to coast. Let us beware of this new power of publicity. It is rushing us rapidly down the slopes of Avernus. It appeals to the worst motives of men, to the peacock qualities that bid us strut and display ourselves before the admiring multitude.

"Dedicated to the proposition that all men are cre-

ated equal." We bear too tamely all this salaaming and kowtowing of exalted persons. We sin against our American principles in so doing. There are no persons so great or so exalted as to demand such attention from us.

I hear the famous New York preacher on the radio but I know full well that in hundreds of churches all over the land there are preachers just as fine and just as eloquent, who are serving obscure parishes and whose voices will never be heard save in the confines of their own limited sphere. But they are God's Prophets, just as valuable as any.

I hear some great actor or singer whom our facile means of broadcasting has brought to the front but I know that there are thousands just as talented in their line, whom the world will never know about. It is fortuitous circumstance, for the most part, that brings some persons before the public gaze and relegates the rest to lifelong obscurity. But let us remember that folks are folks and, after all, not so different; all are worthy of respect, all have something to give of the highest value.

I believe in the common people. I know them to be capable of the best. In every village and small town there are innumerable men and women of talent and genius who are the peers of any we hear about. I am jealous for the common man these days, for his ability, his goodness, his sterling qualities. Upon this foundation, and no other, shall we build the Great Commonwealth.

It pains me to see the ease with which the best of us decline into snobbery and sycophancy. Our "First Families," our so-called "Society," our "Four Hundreds," all are sins against our American spirit, against our American way of life. Let us from this moment laugh out of countenance this adoration of rank and station and a brief authority. Even at gatherings of Christian ministers, where they ought to know better, one can see the "great ones" among the brethren gather around their select tables as if to say to all and sundry: "We are the people!"

Away with this kind of adulation of position and power! It is un-American. If it grips us firmly enough it will lead us straight into the hell amidst which even now Europe is struggling. All men are worthy; all men deserve our respect and honor. If there be any grade or scale in our honor and respect for the brethren let us turn the whole thing end for end and begin to honor those who do the menial and unlovely tasks in life, those who bear our measure of the dirty and unsavory aspects of life.

"Dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This great nation, under God, must continue to give to the common man his inalienable right to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. If this awful system of society into which we are drifting crushes out of men their individuality, their essentially human qualities, their innate skill, their desire to create, then in some way we must simplify our way of life before we perish. We must look to the spiritual health of the common men and women before everything else. Of what value are vast cities and huge congeries of mills and factories if through them men are to become pawns or cogs in a great machine?

This organization of society, becoming ever and increasingly complex, is making of us all a drab and colorless people. Yea, in spite of our glamor and our hectic periods, we are fast losing those qualities that made our forefathers great. It was the small unit of society—the very genius of our America of the beginning—that brought out in men and women the essentially human qualities of our ancestors. A great many of us have got hold of the foolish notion that we can divorce ourselves from the simple ways of the past and be the better for it. It is the most terrible blunder that we in America can possibly make. Vast organizations squeeze the essential goodness out of men. The more complex our way of life, the less of real human beings we become. Let the Iron Man grow a little more and we shall all of us lose our chance of skill, of joy in creative work, of the human qualities that come from facing life in small groups and dealing with Mother Nature in the raw.

Let not the fact that our country is big in area tempt us to think that we must have big industries, big cities, mass control, etc. In no quicker way can we degenerate than by pursuing this mad course. Every big organization in the world only survives and grows by crushing the essentially human qualities out of the majority of its workers.

We are a new nation, a free people, none amongst us is more of a citizen than any other. To be a citizen of this great republic bestows all that a man can desire of dowry or birthright. Liberty and equality, these have been and must continue to be our watchwords. But they perish, if we allow our nation to become a totalitarian super-state where the masses of people are serfs to those who have risen to power. Let us make no mistake about it, that is where we are rapidly drifting unless we call a halt and in some way about-face.

Personally, I would rather see our great cities heaps of ruins, our mighty industries giant derelicts standing idle amid vast rubbish heaps, than continue to move in the direction we are now going. Organization cares nothing for men as men and even if it gives the thirty-hour week still cares just as little for the qualities that make men, men; and women, women. Not less labor but more creative work is what all Americans need, to make them worthy of their great heritage.

Let us build a new framework for our Nation of Tomorrow around a way of life that brings out *human* qualities in men and women. If we have to scrap most of our present gains and return to the farm, let us do it. Surely there is some way to utilize our gains without making them our cruel taskmaster. Of this let us be sure, the man comes before the system; only what preserves and uses those qualities that make for high human living, is worth consideration.

Be it ours to insist upon the God-given privilege of every citizen of these states to be a man or to be a woman. Hordes of dependents upon more or less public charity are not and cannot be men and women. Time was when we, or our forefathers, would have considered it a disgrace to accept such charity. Yet what better can we expect from a system that is slowly disinheriting all of us?

Only by the rebirth of the old American way of life can we save ourselves from this. We cannot have free men and free women in hordes enmeshed by machines and ruled over by machine-minded autocrats. Liberty and equality go along with direct contact with Mother Earth and her challenge to wrest from her a living. It is by the work of our own hands and brains that we become free men and free women. Our varied talents must be used in some way in a free society where only manhood counts. What one does

is immaterial so long as it be clean work for a clean society.

I can see a new society rising in these states upon the ruins of our present order. In this new order mass production of men and machines, super-high schools and super-colleges, mighty factories and coast-to-coast organizations, will disappear. Gone will be cities and all that goes with them. Wherever the good earth invites, there will be small groups of free men and women, craftsmen, artists, singers, musicians, poets, sculptors, scientists. In these new social units of the new society none shall exploit and none cheat or mislead. None for greed of gain shall debase his own and his neighbor's soul. In quietness and in confidence shall these peoples of the new states live their lives. No longer shall men drive over smooth roads at eighty miles an hour to escape from themselves. No longer shall there be vast hordes in the madhouse and vaster hordes of the same sort outside, nerves shot to pieces and emotions surging within with no outlet. In these new small units of society crime shall disappear, for all that are born shall have normal access to all fine human living.

"Is it a dream? Nay, but the lack of it the dream. And, failing this, life's lore and wealth a dream, and all the world a dream."

Democracy—A Form of Social Control

FRANK E. BAKER

Democracy is much more than a political creed or a system of beliefs; broadly speaking, it is a way of life. More specifically, it is a form of government, a method of social control, and a body of political ideals.

As a form of government, it functions in smaller political units directly through the people, as in the New England town meeting, or in larger units through the referendum, as in the adoption of amendments. However, the larger units act mainly through representatives elected by the people, constituting representative democracy.

But this is political democracy only, and the democracy of today penetrates every phase of society. It becomes a form of social control. As such, it establishes working rules, understandings, and agreements by the processes of discussion and common counsel.

If democracy, as defined by Professor Boyd Bode of Ohio State University, is "a social order in which the continuous widening of common interests is made the supreme standard of progress" then collective bargaining is the very essence of democracy.

And so while democracy is being obliterated in whole areas of Europe, in the United States it is being extended into a phase of the people's lives hitherto only slightly touched by it; namely, the relations between capital and labor. This means that those who produce wealth are to have some say about the conditions under which they shall work and the share that they shall receive for it. It means that forty-seven millions of people who hitherto have known only a somewhat remote political democracy are learning democracy by actually experiencing it.

In this way democracy is being strengthened in the United States of America. It could not continue to live in a divided state: democratic politically and autocratic economically. It must become, and in America is becoming, all democratic.

As a body of ideals, it upholds the supreme value of the personality, the freedom of the individual, equality of opportunity, universal suffrage, and public education.

The supreme value of the personality is a fundamental concept in democracy and is a comparatively new one in the history of civilization. The Greeks first developed it, but for free men only. It was largely lost in the other-worldliness and the authoritarianism of the Middle Ages: was revived by the naturalistic philosophers and defined by Rousseau. But the negative philosophy of Rousseau lacked a technique for the development of the individual personality. It remained for John Dewey to give to democracy a method for the development of the individual personality through social experiences, and to make it the supreme value in democratic education.

In a democracy it is the individual that counts and not the taxpayer, personality and not property. Hence, the suggestion of some sheltered professors that individuals on relief should be shorn of citizenship has received scant attention at the hands of the American people.

Freedom was very dear to the Founding Fathers. For it, they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. But the liberty of the Founding Fathers was a very different thing from that of the rugged individualist. The liberty coveted by the Founding Fathers and preserved in the first amendment was an inner, spiritual thing, the right to do all those things necessary to develop a good personality. They put these rights beyond the power of government, by making government the servant and not the master of them.

The Founding Fathers also insured the protection of external liberty in the fifth amendment in these words, "nor [shall he] be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Under this amendment the individual may own and use property, but if, in so doing, he shall exploit another, government may deprive him of the property, but must do so by due process of law.

On the preservation of the inner freedom guaranteed in the first amendment hangs the very fate of American democracy. To adapt itself to the needs of an industrialized, urban, and interdependent society, our democracy must exercise many more controls than were necessary in the frontier life of a century ago. Can democracy do this and still preserve the freedom necessary for the development of personality? It can if, and that "if" is a big one, the avenues of criticism toward the origin, the purpose, and the application of these controls are kept free and open. If and when these avenues are closed in any way whatever, democracy will cease to exist in America as it has ceased to exist in the European dictatorships.

Democratic equality has nothing to do with capacity or ability or achievement; it refers solely to political, social, and economic opportunity. The Declaration of Independence expresses this ideal in the words "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are cre-

ated equal." It is not necessary to discuss the looseness of this statement. The authors of the Declaration were neither psychologists nor biologists. They were primarily political thinkers and they announced to the world that there should be no distinction between persons because of achievement, rank, race, religion, or wealth.

Political equality means universal suffrage, an equal and accessible administration of justice, and equality in all the privileges, powers, and responsibilities conferred or required by government. Socially, it means that there shall be no classes, ranks, or titles of distinction, and, in so far as the powers of government can confer or deny, no special privileges or vested interests. Economically, it means that all shall have the same opportunity in the use of the material resources of the land.

But, as Richard Tawney has pointed out, equality depends not so much on the absence of disabilities as on the presence of abilities. To insure the presence of these abilities, democracy establishes universal, free education.

Social and economic equality do not mean a monotonous uniformity of personalities. In actual fact, they mean just the opposite. A wholly democratic society which denies class distinctions offers equal economic opportunity, guarantees freedom of expression, encourages the growth of unique personalities, and fosters the development of great capacities.

The gist of democracy consists in the essential fact that the supreme coercive power that is the sovereignty of the state shall flow equally from every individual in it. This power, which in the hands of the autocrat is destructive and terrifying, becomes in the hands of the people the all-powerful instrument for the promotion of the common welfare.

Welcome to Thomas Mann*

DOROTHY THOMPSON

You are becoming an American citizen, Thomas Mann. In so becoming, you join a most illustrious company of Americans, who through all the years of our history have adorned and illuminated it. All of us in this country are emigrants or the sons of emigrants, except the Indians. All of us came here for one reason or another. Hundreds of thousands came because agents of industries, combing Europe for cheap labor to develop a growing country, made them believe they would pick up gold in the streets. They lived to prosper or be disappointed. Thousands of others came with a more realistic view of economic opportunity. My own father was a refugee, not from political persecution, but from the economic darkness of the devastated areas of Great Britain—devastated then, half a century ago—and from the class distinctions that oppressed his sensitive spirit. All came with some conception of economic opportunity, but others, and they have been the best, came because a dream, the ancient American dream, of free men, living in a democratic society, captured their imaginations. And every one of those has brought more to America than the work of his hands, for over and over again these refugees from oppression have reminded us of what it is we started out to be; have picked up a dream grown dusty, brushed it off, held it up again before our eyes, and made us love it again.

Think of the names of political refugees that have adorned our history! If I had time, I could fill the evening with an account of their contributions to our development. Think of William Penn. He was, in very truth, a seventeenth-century Martin Niemoeller. For what Penn opposed, as a citizen of England, was the idea of totalitarianism, of the sovereignty of the state over man's conscience, just as you have opposed it, and that other great German whose mouth is now closed in a concentration camp. Time and time again William Penn was imprisoned in his own country for his Quaker beliefs and his political activities in behalf of those beliefs. And when, eventually, he came to this country, he made American history, for though he, the author of the New Jersey constitution, kept as closely as possible to the ancient and fundamental laws of the nation of England, he introduced a new democratic element, established unequivocally the right of men to be tried by a jury of their peers. Later, when he founded Pennsylvania, colonized the Dutch, English, and Swedish dissenters, themselves political refugees, he called it a Holy Experiment, and uttered a great and prophetic word: "Either men must accept the authority of God, or they will be ruled by a Tyrant." And, incidentally, he lived to go back to his mother country and be welcomed with respect and admiration.

I think of Thomas Paine, who came to this country as a mature man, in 1774, a voluntary exile, hostile to the ruling monarchy. No man more than Tom Paine crystallized with his brilliant pen the sentiment for separation of this country from England, and his pamphlet *Common Sense,* written only two years after his arrival here paved the way for the Declaration of Independence. He was an international agitator. Eventually he went back to England, and there published his famous *Rights of Man,* as an answer to Burke, for which he was prosecuted for libel. He fled to France, and was elected to the National Convention and became active in framing the constitution there in 1793. But the Jacobins were too radical for him. They called him a reactionary and so he returned here in 1802. And he, who had been a revolutionary, ended his days in the atmosphere of the *Federalist,* with which the fire of the revolution was translated into organization and law. Incidentally, he was an engineer and contributed more than words to America. He spent the last years of his life on plans for a bridge across the Schuylkill river, and he wrote a pamphlet on the causes of yellow fever, which is still valuable.

Rounding out his years on the Supreme Bench of the United States is a great American, a great Jurist, and a great social philosopher: Mr. Justice

*An address delivered at a dinner in New York given by the American Committee for Christian German Refugees.—*Editor.*

Brandeis, now eighty-one years old, who was born in this country only because his father had to leave Prague as a political refugee in the revolution of 1848. His father, Adolf Brandeis, brought to this country from revolutionary central Europe a passion for human rights and a gratitude for American hospitality which were transmitted to his greater son. He wrote back to his sweetheart in Austria: "I already love this new country so much that I rejoice that I can sing its praises. My patriotism grows every day." His son grew up to justify that patriotism and to translate it into decisions that have made our whole law more illumined and humane.

Woodrow Wilson's forefathers were religious and political refugees from Ulster, Ireland; the ancestors of the LaFollette family were French Huguenot refugees; the grandfather of the Great Commoner, William Jennings Bryan, had the misfortune to be a Scotch Baptist in Ireland. The founder of the New York *Times,* Adolph Ochs, was the son of a German refugee from the general political disturbances in the 1840's.

What causes, lost somewhere else in the world, are not represented here! Puritan refugees founded New England; chivalrous cavaliers helped to make Virginia, and to imbue her with an aristocratic spirit that lives to this day; South Carolina was settled by Huguenots; Acadians from Canada made a long trek to Louisiana; some of the forty-eighters are all through the middle west. No common political belief joins these people, but they have all helped to keep alive the most vital thing in America, the love of freedom, the independent spirit, and some stubborn non-conformity that is the essence of the democratic spirit. And perhaps our chief pride of ancestry is that so many of us are sons of men and women, who at one time or other were willing to die for something, or insisted stubbornly on surviving—without changing their opinions.

And curiously none of the revolutions which flamed in these people's hearts has been translated to this soil, except in the form of helping us always to make new adjustments. Refugees have brought to this country two of the greatest gifts a country can receive —namely, gratitude and faith. And gratitude and faith are not breeders of violence.

Of this distinguished crowd, you are one of the most illustrious, Thomas Mann.

The "Revolution"—What Is To Be Done?

VICTOR S. YARROS

It is generally agreed that an economic, social, and political revolution is actually in progress in the United States. Radicals and advanced "*new* liberals" welcome this revolution; conservatives and tories vehemently denounce it. The former assert that social control in the fields of industry, finance, and business is inevitable and desirable; the latter believe such control to be un-American, detrimental, and vicious. But the fact that we are living and working in the midst of revolution is not disputed.

The Communists and the Socialists profess to know just what this revolution is bringing forth. They are persuaded that we are moving toward *their* goal, and gradually, blunderingly, realizing *their* theoretical program—the program of Marx and his school, in the main. Industry will be socialized or nationalized; "surplus value" in the forms of rent, interest, and profit will be abolished; service, not individual gain, will be the motive force in economic life; the employer-employe relationship will be replaced by direct coöperation; classes will disappear and a classless society will emerge after a period of confusion, conflict, and experimentation. *Planning* of production and distribution will eliminate waste and the dreaded "business cycle"; science will be mobilized by the genuinely democratic government for systematic direction of industrial operations.

To the conservatives and moderate liberals all these promises and forecasts appear naively Utopian. They do not believe in the possibility of a classless society, since they do not believe in equality of capacity, physical or mental. Government planning is to them another name for regimentation, bureaucracy, gross inefficiency, suppression of private initiative, the end of liberty and progress.

Certain able ex-liberals—Mr. Walter Lippman, for example—have repudiated several measures and policies which they had vigorously advocated for a time because, as they say, reflection, observation, and experience have convinced them that those measures or policies, *seemingly* reasonable and moderate enough, would tend and lead to further measures or policies which they could not contemplate without dismay and alarm. Collectivism is totalitarian; it must be opposed and arrested while it is still weak and frail. We must, indeed, proceed to liquidate some collective enterprises, repeal some so-called emergency legislation which violated our constitutional principles and conferred upon the federal executive extraordinary and dictatorial powers; we must restore representative government and liberate industry and labor. "Back to individualism" is the motto of these anxious liberals, back to the ideas of Mill, Spencer, Cobden, Bright, Emerson, Bastiat.

These liberals stoutly affirm that they are *not* in sympathy with the one-sided, false liberalism of the Liberty League or plutocratic Big Business. They assure us that they are consistent, logical, bold, and in fighting *new* privileges, *new* monopolies, *new* subsidies and bounties to various groups, they are not unmindful of the necessity of attacking and eradicating *old* monopolies, *old* privileges, *old* discriminations. They do not hesitate to demand the abandonment of the protective tariff, the parent of many later monopolies and illicit favors. They would do away with mail subsidies, shipping subsidies, press privileges, aviation subsidies. They concede that favors to manufacturers justify farmers in demanding favors to depressed agriculture, organized workers in agitating for favors in the form of anti-injunction statutes, picketing laws, toleration of primary and secondary boycotts, virtual compulsion in behalf of union shops and collective bargaining. But, they argue, the proper and intelligent course today is

not to encourage and support new monopolies, new privileges or subsidies at the expense of the consuming masses, but to get rid of the privileges and monopolies which we have foolishly allowed to spring up and intrench themselves. Let us, they conclude, take long steps *backward;* let us return to the classical and wholesome gospel of a free field and no favors, of the square deal for all, of the Spencerian doctrine of the maximum of freedom within the limits imposed by the principle of equality of freedom.

These anti-collectivist liberals, it must be recognized, have an attractive and alluring program. Hosts of old liberals, of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democrats, of adherents of the classical school of economics, to name no other groups, would gladly join these militant champions of genuine and complete individualism if—but, ah, *what* an "if"!—there were the faintest prospect of substantial success for that fine and noble program. Unfortunately, there is no such prospect. The clock cannot be turned back. The abolition of the old privileges is a practical impossibility. What would be the reaction of Congress, or of the electorate, to a bill reducing all tariff duties to a strictly fiscal revenue basis? Could any candidate for President be elected on such a platform as that, and how many members of Congress could expect to overcome the bitter opposition to them of the manufacturers, the deluded workers in protected industries, the press, and the powerful lobbies? The protective tariff has become a sacred cow, and it is idle and blasphemous to criticize it.

Grover Cleveland ventured to assail protection in tariffs and call it "the communism of pelf." What did he accomplish? Congress passed a tariff bill which he could not conscientiously approve, but he permitted it to become law, knowing full well that the country was not behind him. He failed in his crusade for truer and fairer individualism. We had for several decades a Free Trade League—the writer was a member of it, and for two or three years a director—but it gave up the ghost some time ago because it lost all popular support and all hope of regaining influence or prestige.

And what about the bounties and subsidies, direct or indirect, enjoyed by our industries? Can these be withdrawn? Who will dare suggest such withdrawal, and who will second the motion? The National Association of Manufacturers, the National Industrial Board, the Liberty League? Hardly.

Thus a great many liberals and old-fashioned Americans have been driven, most reluctantly, to the conclusion that the uncompromising anti-collectivist liberals are imagining vain things, indulging in wishful thinking, cherishing illusions. Their alluring program is, alas, Utopian.

What, then, should be their attitude? What can they do? Remain passive or retire from the battle or form a quasi-religious sect of perfectionists? Few Americans would listen to such counsel. Most of us *must* take part in the struggle—the revolution; *must* take sides, *must* work for the principles we deem valid and sound. And most of us are not extremists or fanatics. Neither Communism nor Fascism will succeed in enrolling us. We wish to be "on the side of the angels," on the side of progress, of righteousness, of social justice. Most of us are conscious or unconscious pragmatists; we believe in a practical idealism; we are not interested in unattainable ends; in the words of William James, we naturally tend to ask what "the cash value" of any ideal or doctrine is at the moment, and we act in accordance with the answer.

Now, as pragmatists, we reject all blueprints and all plans for the remote future. As pragmatists, we cross no bridges that are not even in sight. We solve no problems that do not actually challenge us and imperatively dictate solutions. We do not lose sleep over the issues that our grandchildren will have to face. We think and talk in terms of our immediate duty, our next step, our opportunity, and our responsibility.

From this American and sensible viewpoint, what, to repeat, are the sincere friends of liberty, of justice, of democracy, of humanity to do? They should, of course, pursue, wherever possible, the greater good, but where the choice is between two evils, or two dangers, they should choose the lesser. They should bear in mind that, as John Morley said, "in politics the choice is often between two blunders." The blunder to adopt is that which will do the smaller damage, threaten the less grave consequences.

In other words, they must make sure they are coöperating with the forces of good, not of evil, with the streams of tendency making for progress, not with those making for reaction and chaos. To be specific: The liberal may not like coercion and may prefer persuasion, and voluntary agreements in industry. Yet he will not decline to support legislation which promotes and accelerates collective bargaining in industry. He may not like minimum wage laws, or child-labor laws, but he cannot seriously doubt that such laws are "progressive," rather than reactionary, at this juncture. He may object, in principle, to subsidizing farmers and imposing production quotas on them under certain conditions, but, again, he cannot really doubt that agriculture is as entitled to "protection" in the only form possible in that field as manufacturers are in the forms of high customs duties. We cannot apply the laissez-faire theory to agriculture and the policy of artificial and compulsory support to scores of industries long since past the "infant" stage. We cannot let unemployed millions freeze and starve and at the same time insist on the "organic" view of the State and on the duty of citizens to fight, kill, and get killed, for their country. We cannot clamor for budget balancing and forget the *human* budget. We cannot preach fiscal economy and imperil the morale of millions. We cannot save dollars and sacrifice men and women, boys and girls. We cannot pretend to seek the welfare of the nation and at the same time kill ambition, love of work, the creative instinct in millions. We cannot talk of human dignity and human personality and at the same time criminally pauperize millions who cannot find the jobs they vainly seek.

In short, the New Deal is indubitably progressive, *on the whole*, and the millions who, at three elections in six years, approved its philosophy and its major objectives were not *wrong* in their choice. They voted in the main for progress and for righteousness. They are perfectly good Americans, and they believe in liberty and opportunity as devoutly as ever. But they do *not* believe that spiritual and intellectual liberty can be enjoyed, or made to mean anything, unless the people also enjoy a certain amount of economic well-being and economic security. It is a mockery to exhort hungry, shabby, and homeless masses to value free speech and a free press.

Abuse, vituperation, empty slogans, alarms, warnings against regimentation and dictatorship, complaints of high taxes and mounting government debts will not defeat the New Deal or induce the voters to endorse a do-nothing policy. If the New Deal measures and methods strengthen the movement for collectivism and thus undermine the capitalist system, *that cannot be helped*. We must resign ourselves to those consequences. If capitalism cannot solve its problems, take care of its victims, improve and purge itself, then it will have to make way for *some* form of collectivism. We are all evolutionists now, as well as pragmatists. We know that life is not static; that systems undergo change, and that capitalism is not what it was fifty years ago, or what it will be twenty-five years hence. Ideas of property, contract, legality, ethics evolve under the pressure of economic and social forces. The key to the whole present political labyrinth is to be found in the fact that *capitalism is being modified and superseded by collectivism*. The State, says Albert J. Nock, is our enemy. This is the position of the philosophical and individualist anarchists—the school which once flourished in Boston. The State, say the Marxian Socialists, is the tool of the ruling class, everywhere and always, and in America it is the tool of plutocratic capitalism. But millions of American farmers, wage-workers, professional groups, ministers, and humanitarians regard such extreme statements as only half-true. The State *can* be used as an instrument of justice, and has been so used. Experience shows that farmers, union workers, militant liberals of the middle and upper circles have wrested and extorted large concessions from conservative or even reactionary legislative bodies. No important pressure group in America, England, or France, is willing to despair of the State and renounce political methods. Common sense fully warrants this attitude. Democratic government is another name for compromise. To complain of the New Deal's use of government is to complain of an irresistible trend. And that is vain and foolish.

Still, the liberals and the individualists have, and will continue to have, a vital function or mission. They must see to it that the element of coercion and compulsion in the New Deal, or in the on-going revolution, is reduced to a minimum. They must never cease from reminding us that economic justice and economic democracy are not necessarily incompatible with intellectual and spiritual liberty. Planning and regimentation must stop at the economic frontier. Speech, press, and thought must remain free under collectivism, and industrial coöperation should be as voluntary as circumstances and public opinion permit.

To assert that collectivism must lead to dictatorship is to forget that there are such things as racial and national traits, deep-rooted traditions, moral "climates" and settled habits of mind. The revolution now in progress in this country is not modeled upon any other known revolution. It is *American* psychologically and morally. To paraphrase a famous saying of Spinoza, it is our business to understand it, not to groan over it nor to rejoice in it. If we understand it and guide it, violence can be avoided and freedom preserved even in the economic field to a very considerable extent. Science, critical intelligence, modern techniques should enable us to effect a reconciliation between security and freedom, state control or state operation and the merit principle, efficiency, alertness, progressivism, and restraint of private greed.

The greatest service that educators, historians, and other leaders of the people can render at this critical juncture is to interpret fairly and calmly the trend toward collectivism—in America as well as in Europe, to trace that trend to its causes, to point out how we may usefully associate ourselves with that trend, and to prevent extremists from exploiting it in the interest of a dogma, a dubious theory, or a small class.

The Study Table

The Inwardness of Democracy

THE CASE FOR DEMOCRACY. *By Ordway Tead.* 120 *pp. New York: Association Press.* $1.25.

The immediate job, as I see it, before every loyal American, rich or poor, Jew or Gentile, white or colored, is to preserve democracy—our hard-won liberties. If you are interested in doing something for freedom, this is your book. It is a sensible and democratic approach to the problem of our country—how can we "make more of a practical reality for more people our professions of liberty, equality, and fraternity?"

In the Preface, the author says, "The purpose of this book is to show the relation of democracy to the strivings of men of good will for the good life." The book actually does just that. It is truly an essay on "the inwardness of democracy," and it ought to be read widely by men and women in all walks of life.

America is not a dying civilization. It does not need to happen here. There is still something vital and uprushing about America. Mr. Tead calls it "the dynamic character of our economic life." We have vast resources, marvelous machines, expert workmen, a great unexplored market—and "the American dream."

A thought-provoking chapter is called "Democratic Relationships as Governmentally Aided," in which the author deals with the intricate problem of unemployment. No one likes high taxes, but we are staggered by hungry men, women, and children. Some fear the paternalism of Government aid, some think we are drifting too far toward a regimented State, but many will agree with the author in saying: "the conviction is gaining popular acceptance that these provisions are better described as democratic and communal efforts to do in an organized way something to assure basic material support to a section of the community that has not thus far had adequate or equal treatment in these fundamental matters."

Good will alone will not solve our problems, economic, political, or social. There must be intelligent and inventive associated action in many fields. In a vital democracy, we must be interested in all men. We must not only "live and let live, we must live and help to live."

JAMES M. YARD.

Correspondence

An Appeal to Save the World

Editor of UNITY:

At work upon a play dealing with the French revolution, I have been reading the documents of that time, and in a thousand details am struck by resemblances with events now being reported. History is repeating itself, and mankind has not learned enough from the sufferings of a whole continent over a century and a half.

The people of France attempted in 1789 to break the chains of feudalism, and the monarchies of Europe went to war to put those chains back upon their wrists. The result was the ravaging of a continent by twenty-two years of mass-slaughter; the so-called Holy Alliance was riveted upon Europe, and the people of France were forced to wage several wars, both foreign and civil, before they won their elementary political rights.

One continent was involved in that struggle; but today we see the same course of events upon three continents. The peoples of Abyssinia, Spain, and China are fighting heroically for the rights of self-government; four autocracies are banded together against them; several more are lending secret aid, and the whole world is involved in a campaign of official lying. Conditions today are in many ways more sinister and deadly than those which prevailed in revolutionary France. In those days there were few newspapers, and the war of ideas was carried on by leaflets and pamphlets which were easy to print; but today the giant press is in the hands of special privilege, and in the radio the ruling classes have made themselves a master weapon for controlling the mass-mind. In 1789 military weapons were crude; the people of Paris could forge themselves fifty thousand pikes in thirty-six hours, and with these overthrow a nine hundred-year old despotism. But today a people cannot get free without rifles and machine-guns, and in the last few years it has been demonstrated to the world that they cannot stay free unless they can manage to persuade the masters of munition factories to make them bombing and pursuit-planes, giant cannon hauled by tractors—all the equipment of mechanized militarism, costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

The system of production for private profit, dying of the poisons engendered in its own body, is today dragging to its doom the civilization which it has helped to spread and develop. Five years ago I defined Fascism as "Capitalism plus murder." That was the truth then. Class privilege, terrified by the spread of revolt against mass suffering, created a new force for its defense. But now we see a further development; the new force, Fascism, turning out to be stronger and more deadly than its creator. Gangsterism has seized the world, and the capitalists too have a master. . . .

How can such things happen? The answer is that privileged classes would rather see civilization perish than sacrifice their own power to exploit. In every nation where the profit-system prevails, the masters of munitions, of steel and oil and money, speculators in the means of human life, gamblers in misery, death, and destruction, are openly or secretly the friends of Fascism-Naziism; still clinging to the hope that they can master it or buy it, and use it for the holding down of the workers, the preventing of a new birth of democracy in the world, this time in industry as well as in government.

The result is that patriotism today is a deception in our society; class has become more than country, and in every government the rulers are intriguing with other governments to keep the people down, betraying them, betraying civilization itself. That is why in France the money-lords are willing to see Germany fortifying the Pyrenees, and Italy plotting to cut them from Africa, and counter-revolution preparing to destroy the democracy of France. That is why the British Tories have been willing to risk the cutting of the lifeline of their Empire, and to see Germany win the World War twenty years after—rather than take the risk of that Socialism which must surely follow a Hitler or a Mussolini defeated in war. . . .

Even in my own "sweet land of liberty," we have in our State Department men who are open sympathizers with reaction, and who, with the consent of our President, are using a hypocritical "neutrality act" as a means of strangling the democratically chosen people's government of Spain, and denying it the right to purchase arms for its own defense. This action is putting an iron band of Fascism about Spain; it is subjecting France to British Tory intrigue, and in the end it may break democracy in Europe.

Against such array of military and money power there is no defense save in the awakening people. To all workers and producers, whether of hand or brain, wherever these words of mine may be able to penetrate, I plead: Do not permit this conspiracy against justice and human right to take another step toward triumph. People of France, do not permit the Spanish border to be sealed. People of Britain, stop the deal with Hitler which will permit the sacrifice of the little peoples of Central Europe. People of Soviet Russia, help the world to understand more clearly the difference between producers and exploiters, and why all the hopes of the future lie in the producers. People of Asia, lift your voices against the military lords of Japan. People of South America, cherish your revolutionary traditions, and do not permit money to become more than liberty and truth.

To the people of my own country, Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, I plead that they will prepare for that new birth of freedom which our great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, promised us, and see to it that government of the people, by the people, and for the people does not perish from the earth. To enlightened and truth-loving people of the whole earth I plead that they will make their voices heard in this crisis, and let it be known that moral values still count for something in the affairs of men; that government by gangsters is not and shall not be the final destiny of our civilization.

UPTON SINCLAIR.

Pasadena, California.

Coöperative Managers

Editor of UNITY:

"Managers Needed" sounds like the come-on lead of a shyster promoter. The fact is, however, that we are embarrassed by a lack of management material for the many new Consumer Coöperative stores opening in our territory. To meet this need the Eastern Coöperative League is running a two-week training school at Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Massachusetts, from July 31 to August 13. Young men with an interest in Consumers Coöperation and at least a minimum of retail food store experience are needed. They must be able to adjust themselves to the different concept of management necessary as an employee of the consumer.

For those desiring further information on the practical development of a Coöperative as well as history and theory, an institute is scheduled from July 31 to August 6 at a total cost of $14.00 per person.

A recreational leadership course is planned for July 16-23 at Silver Bay on Lake George, New York.

We are sure your readers would appreciate knowing of these opportunities for an unusually fine and inexpensive vacation combined with significant social study. Additional details will be sent upon request.

ROBERT L. SMITH, *Assistant Secretary,*
Eastern Coöperative League.
112 *Charlton St.,*
New York City.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 130)

3. Watch lest the churches become too rich. Let the churches avoid such degree of entanglement with the status quo as to become apologists for things as they are and neglect their prophetic function.

4. Develop the conference idea among religious citizens. Neighborhood round tables, together with local coöperative acts which insure the rights and liberties of all Christians and Jews, reduce national tensions. Americans must increase trust and understanding among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, for we have a community of interests, and common antagonists.

5. The religious people of America must translate their faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man into a working democratic economy lest the marching boots of revolution tramp our roads too. Religious people, before all others, should be aware that the best guard against Nazi, Communist and Fascist propaganda is to produce an American social order better than these can promise.